

In particular, Blankesteijn describes a system that propagates data changes from a data change source to a data change destination via a replication mechanism. Blankesteijn at Abstract. In the Blankesteijn system, a data change includes “creation, update, deletion or any other modification act performed upon an entity in a database.” Blankesteijn at paragraph [0055]. To improve processing speeds, the Blankesteijn system filters out irrelevant data changes and collects and bundles data changes into data change objects prior to propagation. Blankesteijn at paragraphs [0017], [0018], and [0071]. Although the Blankesteijn system propagates data changes and formats the propagated data changes into data change objects, the Blankesteijn system does not modify, based on generation parameters associated with a subscription generator, a list of subscriptions generated based on execution of a query against portions of application data. Rather, the data change objects in the Blankesteijn system define what data to propagate to data change destinations, not which data change destinations receive data changes. As such, in propagating database changes, the Blankesteijn system has a set list of data change destinations, which is not modified.

Therefore, each of Bracho, Blankesteijn, and the proposed combination, fails to describe or suggest modifying, based on generation parameters associated with a subscription generator, a list of subscriptions generated based on execution of a query against portions of application data, as recited in independent claim 1. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1 and its dependent claims.

Independent claims 10 and 19, although different in scope from claim 1 and each other, recite features similar to those in claim 1 discussed above. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10 and 19 and their dependent claims.

Dependent Claims 27 and 30

With respect to dependent claims 27 and 30, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 27 and 30 at least for the reason of their dependency on independent claim 1. In addition, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 27 and 30 because Bracho and Blankesteijn, either singly or in combination, fail to describe or suggest the additional subject matter recited in dependent claims 27 and 30.

Dependent Claim 27

With respect to dependent claim 27, the Office Action refers to paragraph [0135] of Blankesteijn for the features of removing at least one employee to exclude in generating subscriptions for a publication from a list of subscriptions generated based on execution of a query and adding at least one employee to include in generating subscriptions for the publication to the list of subscriptions generated based on execution of the query. This portion of Blankesteijn describes filtering data change objects. Filtering data change objects, however, relates to what (if any) data to propagate in a data change object, which is not removing or adding an employee to a list of subscriptions generated based on execution of a query. Moreover, because filtering involves removing or limiting data, this portion of Blankesteijn necessarily cannot describe or suggest adding at least one employee to a list of subscriptions generated based on execution of a query. Thus, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 27 for at least these additional reasons.

Dependent Claim 30

With respect to dependent claim 30, the Office Action refers to paragraphs [0267] to [0269] of Blankesteijn for the feature of identifying a subset of multiple subscription generators to be run based on a determination of whether each of the multiple subscription generators is to be run. This portion of Blankesteijn describes that multiple stores may be included in a subscription and that particular stores may be added or removed from the subscription. Adding and removing stores from a subscription, however, does not include identifying a subset of multiple subscription generators to be run based on a determination of whether each of the multiple subscription generators is to be run. Rather, the addition and removal of stores in Blankesteijn relate to an identification of which stores to include in a subscription, not an identification of which generators to run in generating a list of subscriptions. Thus, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 30 for at least these additional reasons.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1, 10, and 19 have been provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 7, and 15 of copending Application No. 10/784,196. Without conceding obviousness, applicant respectfully requests that this provisional rejection be held in abeyance until the claims of both this application and those in Application No. 10/784,196 are otherwise held to be allowable.

Conclusion

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 22, 2009

/Jeremy J. Monaldo/
Jeremy J. Monaldo
Reg. No. 58,680

Customer No.: 32864
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945